

The Times-Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office.....115 E. Main Street
South Richmond.....1103 Hull Street
Petersburg Bureau.....109 N. Byamore Street
Lynchburg Bureau.....212 Eighth Street

BY MAIL. One Six Three One
POSTAGE PAID. Year. Mo. Mo. Mo.
Daily with Sunday.....\$4.00 \$1.00 \$1.50
Daily without Sunday.....4.00 2.00 1.00
Sunday edition only.....2.00 1.00 .50
Weekly (Wednesday).....1.00 .50 .25

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg—

One Week.
Daily with Sunday.....10 cents
Daily without Sunday.....10 cents
Sunday only.....5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1910.

ORGANIZED LABOR AGAINST SLEMP.

The Industrial Era, of Roanoke, which is published "in the interests of the trades unions and of the Farmers' Union of Virginia," comes out strongly this week against Slomp, and, therefore, for Stuart, for Congress in the Ninth. This is an avowed declaration of union labor in Virginia against Slomp and Stumpism, and means that those who have the interests of the laboring man at heart will repudiate Slomp at the polls next month. Union labor takes the attitude that, regardless of parties, it will vote for that man who is a true and consistent friend of labor.

It will be recalled that the Sherman anti-trust law has been construed so as to cripple union labor. The adverse decision of the court was appealed from by organized labor, the indirect appeal being taken to Congress; for, at the last session of Congress, there was a measure proposed having in view the appropriation of \$200,000 to prosecute violators of the Sherman law. An amendment was offered declaring that no part of it should be used to prosecute union labor. This was defeated, Slomp voting against it.

The Era says: "How did Mr. C. B. Slomp vote? Under the shadow of the 'big stick,' he voted to bedevil and enslave the workers. For a mass of public patronage, he voted to chain them to the chariot wheels of capital and drag them eternal captives to the non-producers. But it is now our time to vote, and we are going to vote man. We are not fighting a battle for any party. We are contending for the rights of the men who make the wealth of the world. . . . Now we are going to rebuke the men who turned a deaf ear to our appeal."

In his attitude toward organized labor Henry Stuart towers superbly above Slomp, the slave of the interests and of capital. The Era says of Stuart—and let it be said that the Era would never have said anything if it had not examined every letter and punctuation mark of his record, just as it did in the case of Slomp:

"Though a man who has held but two public positions in his life, his reputation for fairness and friendliness to the wage-earners and the men who toil has been clearly established, both as a private citizen of large interests and as a public servant. Mr. Stuart, in his campaign, is demonstrating by his daily utterances that he is for a 'square deal' for the laboring man, and that if elected to Congress he will favor such laws as will afford the laboring man the consideration and protection he deserves."

The Era then reviews the labor record of Mr. Stuart, and finds that through and through, in and out, up and down, he is a sincere friend of organized labor. The Era finds a great deal to approve in the kindly treatment which Mr. Stuart has always accorded to his own employees, who esteem him and are supporting him unanimously. In his private life, his relations with laboring people have been all that could be desired.

In his capacity as a public servant Mr. Stuart has been conspicuously for the interests of labor. In the Constitutional Convention Mr. Stuart joined in the movement to write into the Constitution the principle of the Employers' Liability Act, and this movement was successful. He was active in this same body in enlarging and improving in every way making more servicable to the masses of the people the public school system, which is "a blessing and a benefaction to the laboring people everywhere." As a member of the State Corporation Commission, Mr. Stuart was always impartial and just when questions arose involving the rights of corporations on the one hand and the rights of the people on the other.

The Era asserts that in his campaign Mr. Stuart has impressed it beyond doubt on the minds of the people "that his fight is for the consumer, the masses, the great body of the men who do the work of the country, as against the protected classes, who are growing rich by exacting enormously extravagant prices for the necessities of life (the laboring man) has to buy for himself and family."

In speaking of his attitude toward the laboring man, Mr. Stuart has said during his campaign:

"What is the hope of the wage-earner, the man in overalls? He goes to the 'stand-patter,' points out that the necessities of life have advanced from 20 to 40 and 50 per cent, while his wages have not increased in like ratio. He asks for lower duties on sugar, clothing, boots and shoes and other manufactured articles of daily use. The reply he gets is that the stand-patters are standing pat, but have appointed a committee to investigate the high prices of the bread and meat supply from the farm—no committee to investigate the high prices of manufactured articles."

"I am opposed to a policy which, in the name of protection to American labor, imposes such tariff duties on all the necessities of life that the laborer has to buy as to strip him of his earnings. I am opposed to a policy which lays a thin crust of protection for the laborer, and builds on it, for the

benefit of a privileged class, a colossal Egyptian Pyramid, so ponderous and top-heavy as to crush the laborer for whose benefit it was professedly built, and with him the masses of the American people."

There can be little doubt that Henry Stuart will receive the ballots of all labor men and friends of organized labor in the Ninth District. His record alone is enough to elect him, and with the support of the labor press behind him, he will surely rally to his flag every man who believes in rendering justice to labor. Slomp is the cringing, equivocal, obsequious-making ally of the very interests that are opposed to labor. Slomp is the slave of capital, but Stuart has always been the strong friend of labor, and always will be so.

GOOD-BYE, FLY.

The Colonel appears to be getting a little worried. He admitted to Ez Prentice the other day that he was tired and wanted to "lay off" for a week, and on Saturday he fired the opening gun at Oyster Bay in the crusade against the little festive house fly, the cause of more trouble to the human race than any other insect known except possibly the politician. A dispatch to the Washington Herald says that "the Colonel was very harsh to the house fly." It reminded him of the spirilla tick of Africa, of which the natives stand in great dread, equalled only by their fear of the sleeping sickness. The Colonel declared that "sleeping sickness held no terrors for me," and we venture to say that he is personally not scared of the house fly; but his broad human heart suffers for the woes of all the people, and in striking a blow against the fly he has again endeared himself to the world.

The doctors and health officers of one sort and another have been talking against the fly for years, have printed pictures of him in almost every possible pose and have written scientific articles about him and calculated the number of germs he carries on his feet; but never until now has a death-dealing blow been aimed at him. After the Colonel gets through with him, we may all join in singing that great classic of the modern musical world, "Shoo, fly, don't bother me." The fly is as good now as if he never was.

RATHER FAVORABLE TO "UNCLE JOE."

The Republican State Central Committee of Colorado has given out a statement setting forth the attitude of the Republican candidates for Congress in that State on the election of Mr. Cannon as Speaker of the next House in the event that the Republicans shall have a majority in that body. Many letters and telegrams have been received by the candidates asking them to say how they will stand towards Cannon, and these have been answered as the candidates thought best and on their own responsibility. Says the Committee: "Each and all of them have asserted in positive terms that they stood squarely upon the Republican State and National platforms, and that they would, if elected, at all times support the National Republican Administration and its policies, and that they would support for Speaker only a Republican in full accord with President Taft and his policies. This position is all that can be asked for by any Republican voter, and is entirely satisfactory to the Republican State organization."

It ought to be. There was never a cleverer bit of dodging, and the Republicans never get anything but by dodging. It means, as we interpret it, that the Colorado Republicans will vote for Speaker Cannon, that is to say, unless they have made up their minds to quit the Republican party, Mr. Cannon being the Republican party incarnate. He is the most typical representative of it and its policies. He has never varied a hair's breadth in his loyalty to it. It was through his efforts that the present tariff law was passed. He has conformed to all its purposes and wielded his power in its interest. Cannonism is Republicanism, and nothing more. The fact that he has been selected as the scapegoat upon which to unload all the sins of his party is one of the most ungrateful things in the history of American politics. Of course, he should not be elected Speaker unless the Republicans shall have a majority in the next House, which is not at all thinkable, but there is no other Republican who deserves so much from his fellow-citizens and none of half his courage and devotion to the interests of the fattest political party that has ever been known in any civilized country.

WHAT IS TESTIMONY WORTH?

One of the oldest questions which have confronted administrators of justice is how to estimate the weight and credence which shall be accorded testimony, a variable quantity even under the most favorable conditions. The advent of the psychologist into the field has served to make the problem more complex and the miniature Munsterbergs of our land have met with scant courtesy at the hands of the judges and members of the bar.

A Swiss university professor lately has been making experiments to test the value of the testimony of the average man. He picked out fifty-four students from his class and called on them to give oral answers to questions about different features of the university building and objects about the grounds which each day came within the range of their vision. The result was that not one of the entire fifty-four answered correctly the eight questions of the test. When asked about a particular window, forty-five said that it did not exist and one said that he was unable to say whether it existed or not. Some days later a masked man was brought into the class room. He was introduced to the "witnesses." Two days later they were asked to describe him. There was a

very wide variance in the replies to questions regarding his height, build, and general appearance. Ten masks of different makes were produced and only four succeeded in selecting the one worn by the masked visitor.

"All these persons," says the professor, "are men of education and culture. What then are we to think of the statements made in criminal courts by persons who belong to less educated classes?"

However much they may differ on minor details, witnesses in the majority of cases agree on the substantial and structural facts. A witness who tries to show exact knowledge of minute details is rarely given that weight that he might seem to merit. The honest witness who knows the essential features is usually accorded more weight and credence than the over-minute witness. The academic experiments are valuable as to testimony as to detail—but they go no further.

THE AMENDING HABIT.

In the same month that the voters of Virginia will be called upon to decide the fate of the four proposed amendments to our Constitution, the voters of Louisiana will have to record their judgment on no less than fifteen constitutional amendments. From the history of the efforts made to amend the Constitution of the Pelican State since the adoption of its latest Constitution in 1898, four years before the adoption of the present Constitution of Virginia, perhaps Virginia may extract some conclusions which may be of benefit peculiarly at this time.

The esteemed New Orleans Times-Democrat tells us that the present Constitution is "supposedly complete and up-to-date, for it is 40 per cent. longer than the Constitution of 1878, and nearly five times as long as the ante bellum Constitution of 1852. Altogether seventy amendments have been thrown at the voters for their judgment, many of them faulty, some of them most objectionable, a majority hastily and carelessly prepared, the good so mixed with the evil that it has been difficult to separate them. One amendment notoriously unconstitutional was submitted, and several of the amendments are identical, having been resurrected after one popular defeat, the idea apparently being that they would slip through by popular neglect or oversight, the attention of the voters being concentrated on some particular amendments to the neglect of others."

The people of Louisiana are very much confused—just as are the people of Virginia now—over the proposed amendments to their Constitution. The voters there, as here, have nothing to guide them. In Oregon, the State distributes to each voter the complete text of the suggested amendment, accompanied by a statement of the law behind it, the effect of the amendment if passed, and concise argument on both sides of the suggested amendment by its defenders and opponents. Voters, in this way, are enabled to pass intelligently on far-reaching questions. In Louisiana, as in Virginia, this work of political enlightenment is left wholly to the press. In both Virginia and Louisiana some of the newspapers are doing their full duty; but what the Times-Democrat says of Louisiana can be said likewise of the Old Dominion. "Some of the State papers remain 'mum' or are muzzled on certain points, and great confusion exists."

What is the result of this confusion and lack of information on the part of the electorate? Hear our contemporary again:

"The amendments have ceased, therefore, to express the popular will. On some of them less than a quarter of the popular vote is cast, and a number have been carried by less than one-sixth of the voters. It is time to call a halt upon the methods and practices that have prevailed and to make the vote on the amendments a true, intelligent expression of the popular will."

Change the name of the State, and this applies to Virginia with startling exactness. The ease and rapidity with which the four proposed amendments gilded noiselessly through the General Assembly here seems to have been repeated in Louisiana. The Times-Democrat further declares:

"No legislature has ever submitted such important constitutional amendments to the voters so crudely prepared, so without explanation or argument. There has never been in Louisiana nor any other State of the Union a legislative meeting so absolutely devoid of any intelligent information that could throw the slightest light on the work of legislation as the two last sessions. The great mass of the constitutional amendments passed without debate and without opposition."

"The name having been changed, the story applies to Virginia. The amendments proposed 'gum-shod' through the General Assembly here in practically the same way that they did in Louisiana, and the apathy and silence here was not in anywise different from that manifested in the Pelican State."

Now, what is the logical and inevitable result of conditions in Louisiana? In a short time, the original constitution will be so dissected and patched together and then torn apart again that a constitutional convention will have to be called. The Legislature will go on until it has amended the constitution to the point of assassination.

The reason for this is that the legislature of Louisiana, starting out with a few proposed amendments, as is the case now in Virginia; has acquired "the amending habit." Having once started, there is no end to the proposing of changes in the organic law. While Virginia has waited six years longer than Louisiana to make the first attempt to amend, the principle is not altered by that fact. Get Virginia started once, and it will not be long until our General Assembly will have proposed a considerable proportion of the number of changes proposed in its sister State.

If the people of this Commonwealth are unwilling that their legislature should get the "amending habit," it

they are unwilling to call a constitutional convention in about ten years, let them vote against all these proposed amendments. Let Virginia now resolve to retain its reputation for conservatism in matters pertaining to its constitution, and let the people by their negative ballots on these changes uphold the indictment that these proposed amendments are unjustifiable and against the peace and welfare of the State.

THROWN OUT BY STIMPSON.

Stimpson made a speech in Carnegie Hall last Friday night. It was the first big meeting of his campaign, and there was a large crowd present. Otto Barnard also made a speech, and the nomination of Stimpson was ratified in due and proper form; but not until after Miss Maud Malone, poor little Suffragette, had impressed herself upon the meeting in a most significant way.

Stimpson was nervous. He began to read his speech, which was a general attack on Dix, and just about the time he got over his first stage fright and was preparing to "eat 'em alive," Miss Maud arose from her seat in the orchestra, fully armed and equipped with some question or questions she wished to ask the candidate. Immediately there was a great uproar in the house and the air was filled with cries of "Put her out!" "Sit down!" "Let her have her say!" and the like. Lieutenant Patrick O'Neill, of the West Forty-seventh Street Station, pushed his way down to the neighborhood, accompanied by four stalwart officers (it is hoped that he was the only one of this brave bunch who hailed from dear old Ireland—shame upon you, Pat!), but Miss Maud stood her ground, as unflinched as the May morning in her own native country, and waited for the shouting of the captains and the mob to die away, so that she might interrogate the speaker about some matters of vital importance to the campaign upon which he was entering; but they wouldn't let her speak or even ask her questions. It was when the situation seemed to be most desperate that the chairman, the Hon. Seth Low, in his sweet and gentle and gentlemanly way, sought succor from the confusion of the hour, and finally making himself heard above the uproar, said:

"I gather that the lady wishes to ask a question. Madame, you have been invited here to listen to certain speeches and you will add greatly to the comfort of the rest of the audience if you will resume your seat and listen to them."

Mr. Low was entirely at himself, and made his request in the most gentlemanly terms consistent with his duties as the presiding officer of the meeting, holding with old John Tobin that "the man that lays his hand upon a woman, save in the way of kindness, is a wretch whom 'twere gross flattery to name a coward." But it wouldn't work. Miss Maud kept her feet, and the noise and hooting increased, which wasn't Mr. Low's fault, and then it was that Stimpson, beside himself with ill-concealed rage, sprang to his feet, leaned far over the front of the stage (it will be noted that he did not go down into the orchestra), and wildly waving his hands at Miss Maud, shouted: "Sit down! Sit down!" Did Miss Maud sit down? No, she stood up more stately and picturesque than ever. Then Stimpson, the crowd having been hushed, possibly by curiosity to see whether Stimpson would really tackle her or not, addressed the lady in these scathing terms:

"Madam, you have been invited into this meeting. Here is an opportunity for you to learn a lesson in citizenship by seeing the proper method by which public discussions are carried on. There is a proper time and a proper place to discuss all things, and I would advise you to resume your seat and await that time."

But Miss Maud remained standing, and could be heard above the tumult: "Mr. Stimpson." She got no further. Mr. Stimpson, with defiance ringing in his voice and likewise in his hands, shouted, "If you cannot take a suggestion there is no other alternative but for you to remove yourself," which with the aid of five stalwart men of the New York police force Miss Maud was enabled to do.

It doesn't matter much what Stimpson said after that. The crowd did not seem to care; but he was "ratified," and that was what the meeting was held for. It will be many a long day, however, before Miss Malone will forgive him for not answering her question. We have no doubt that it was a perfectly proper question, and Stimpson's failure to treat the lady kindly will make a bad impression on the electorate. A candidate for Governor of the State of New York who is so doubtful of himself that he could not answer one little question asked by one little woman could hardly be expected to deal with the affairs of a great State successfully. But Stimpson has probably not been told what to do in such cases. He ought to ask for "instructions" on all such points, so that he may do about the thing his maker would have him do in such emergencies.

LABOR AND THE SUPREME COURT.

That President Taft was eminently correct when he predicted that the Supreme Court of the United States would within the next decade pass on questions of vital and far-reaching importance is a proposition that none will deny. His statement of the magnitude of the work which might be accomplished within a few years by the national tribunal was well-nigh prophetic.

It was only a short while ago that we pointed out that the pending trust cases before the Supreme Court involved millions and millions of dollars and the life and death of nearly three hundred wealthy corporations. The decree in just two cases will be binding on a legion of subsidiary corporations, and the financial effect of

these decisions it is almost impossible to compute at present.

No less important are the labor cases now on the docket of the Court. There is an unusually large number of cases affecting labor and industry awaiting early settlement. In view of the fact that our labor decisions of the past fail to reveal a very clear judicial policy, the value of these cases may be tremendous, so far as the future of labor is concerned.

Among the cases that are to come up shortly are the Gompers contempt case, the employers' liability law cases, the safety appliance law, the "hours of service" cases, the peonage cases, the Chinese importation cases, and the Arkansas "full crew" act cases. These are all of deep interest to labor.

The Gompers-Mitchell-Morrison contempt case involves matters which go to the root of the relation between the laboring man and the capitalist. From the labor viewpoint, it is a matter of the fundamental right of free speech and freedom of the press; from the side of capital, primary rights of ownership and freedom in the conduct of private business are involved. There is the further question in this case of the extent to which injunctions in labor disputes may be disregarded with impunity.

At this term an attempt will be made to have the employers' liability law passed by Congress in 1908 declared unconstitutional. The Supreme Court, it will be remembered, held the employers' liability act of 1906 to be void. This decision was received by labor as a great blow. The reason of the decision of the Court was that the law "sought to regulate individuals and corporations engaged in intrastate commerce as well as those engaged in interstate commerce." Those who seek to have the later act declared void rest their contentions on substantially the same ground.

Another law which has been attacked as void is "the hours of service law for railroad employees." The Court is expected to render a decision in this case at a very early time. This was an act of Congress passed in 1907, having as its purpose the limiting of the hours of service to be required of railroad employees. It was attacked at the outset on the ground that, similarly to the employers' liability law, it applies to persons engaged in intrastate business as well as to those employed in interstate business.

STRIKER DROPS STIMPSON.

Dr. M. W. Stryker, President of Hamilton College at Utica, has cut loose from Stimpson, and will support Dix and the other Democratic candidates in New York State. He says that the convention at Saratoga was not representative of the Republican party, that it was seized by Roosevelt and dominated by him throughout, that he does not think it is safe or desirable to surrender to Roosevelt, and that the best interests of the people and the State of New York will be best served by the election of the Democratic ticket. Dr. Stryker is a Republican of very pronounced views, and has in former campaigns made speeches for Republican candidates and presided at Republican meetings. This, of course, is not very much to his credit, but he has turned over a new leaf now, and will stand with the people for the safety of the State. He is only one of many thousands of very good citizens who will do the same thing. It looks as if Stimpson had really played out his string. The best thing he can do is to give up and make it unanimous for Dix.

The New York Evening Sun says the Scott place, near Abbotsford, which the Frank Jay Gould family is reported to have taken on a short lease, was formerly the property of one Walter Scott, a literary man of some reputation in his day. The Sun adds: "Melrose Abbey might be made quite a presentable garage for the family at no great expense." What's the use of talking like that? If the Abbey is for rent, why shouldn't Mr. Gould rent it if he want it? The Scotts probably need the money.

Mrs. Wilhelmina Fleming, of the Harvard College Observatory, has found another new star. Only sixteen stars have been found in the last twenty-five years, and of these thirteen have been found by the women assistants of the Harvard Observatory. Yet there are a lot of political star-gazers who insist that women should not have the right to vote.

The New York Times has gone into the scientific side of baseball, and in a particularly luminous article, discussing the "seventh inning" argues that this inning has won the descriptive title of "the fatal seventh" because it is at this point in the game that the players give way to the "narrowness" of their specialization and the vivacity of their emotions. In the speech of the plain people, they get tired. But it is well to know how the philosophers regard their frequent failures to "line her out" and "take her in" at this crucial stage of the game. It didn't matter very much in the Virginia State League as it was; but in the new League there is to be no "fatal seventh." In all the innings the players are to play as if they know how.

Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

Secession and Readmission of States.
When, and in what order, did the Southern States secede from the Union, and when were they again readmitted?
S. Carolina, Dec. 20, 1860. June 11, 1868.
Mississippi, Jan. 9, 1861. Feb. 23, 1870.
Alabama, Jan. 11, 1861. June 11, 1868.
Florida, Jan. 11, 1861. April 30, 1868.
Georgia, Jan. 19, 1861. April 20, 1868.
Louisiana, Jan. 26, 1861. June 11, 1868.
Texas, Feb. 1, 1861. Mar. 15, 1870.
Virginia, April 16, 1861. Jan. 15, 1870.
Arkansas, May 6, 1861. Mar. 18, 1870.
Tennessee, May 21, 1861. June 11, 1868.
Kentucky, June 4, 1861. July 1, 1866.

The Lucky Horseshoe.
Please give me the origin of the horseshoe as an object of good luck.
Most of the houses in the West End of London were protected against witches and evil spirits in the seventeenth century, says John Aubrey, the English antiquary, by having horseshoes fastened to them in various ways. It was the belief that then no witch or evil genius could cross the

ALL GERMANS MOURN PASSING OF KAINZ

BY LA MARQUESE DE FONTENAY.
B EFORE me lies a photograph, exceedingly rare of which there are only two in the world. The one remaining in existence, which, taken at Lucerne in 1881, represents the Emperor of Austria, Emperor of Germany, with the celebrated German actor, Kainz, who has just died at Vienna, universally mourned throughout the German-speaking world as the greatest genius of the Teutonic stage in the last half-century.

This photograph and half-a-dozen letters addressed by the King to the actor are all that remain of a friendship of three months, which terminated as suddenly as it began. The King saw Kainz play the role of Didier in the play, "Marion Delorme," at the Royal Theatre at Munich, in April, 1881, when he so delighted with the representation that he came three nights in succession to see it, sending him on each occasion a handsome bouquet of flowers. He then came to visit him at the Chateau de Linderhof, where the actor remained for two weeks.

On the 22d of June the King left Munich incognito for Switzerland, where he was joined by the actor, and by the time they were so intimate with one another that the King was calling Kainz "Didier" and himself "Saverio." In fact, Kainz received several letters from him during the brief friendship signed "Louis Saverio." The King was passionately fond of mountaineering and was a perfect Hercules in strength and endurance. He was insensible to fatigue. On the other hand, the actor became easily tired, and was very nervous. One night, when they had made the ascent together of the Ruti, the King insisted that Kainz should recite to him a scene from the play, "The Last Days of Pompeii," which Kainz had just played at the Ruti, where Kainz spent the remainder of the night. They saw each other again at the Chateau de Linderhof, where there was a species of reconciliation. Two days afterwards they left by train for Munich. At the last station before reaching the Bavarian frontier, the King bade adieu to Kainz, embracing him as he did so. That was their farewell. They never saw each other or wrote to one another again.

Lord Grey's impending visit to the West Indies is not a pleasure trip but is being taken at the instance of the imperial government, with the object of fostering closer relations in favor of closer commercial relations between the Dominion and the West Indies. The Governor-General will make the voyage on board the one of the two cruisers which the Canadian government has recently purchased from the Admiralty in England. The permission of the Admiralty, however, first to be obtained, for the use of the ship for this purpose is attached to the Canadian government has acquired the ownership of the cruisers. It has no right to employ them on any service outside the coast of Canada, and without the sanction of the Admiralty—that is to say, of the Imperial Government. The cruiser, which has been fitted out at Devonport, is now under the supervision of the Canadian-born Rear-Admiral Kingsmill, and is now on its way across the Atlantic, to take on board Lord Grey at Halifax.

The Governor-General will, while in the West Indies, discuss the arrangements for the extension of the preferential tariff arrangement between the Dominion and the West Indies, recommended in the report just issued by the royal commission, and the arrangements for the West Indies, recommended by Lord Balfour of Burleigh. Another recommendation is that of the improvement of the communication by steamship and by telegraph and the establishment by a Dominion company of a mail service between Canada and the West Indies.

Lord Elphinstone, who married the other day Miss Mary Lyon, has now brought his bride home, to live at Carberry Tower, his place in Midlothian, near Musselburgh, where she has been residing since her marriage. The bride of their chieftain when she first came to the tower, Carberry Tower is the scene of many a historical event—it was close by that the Duke of Argyll and his wife awaited the confederate lords, and parted, never to meet again, and it also figures in the famous ballad known as "Quincey's Revenge."

The De Quincey family had at one time vast possessions in Scotland, but they sided with the Balfours in the war of succession for the throne, and on the accession of Bruce to the throne, forfeited the crown and conferred on the Duke of Albany. The family fortunes seem to have been a Northamptonshire Baron Robert de Quincey, who acquired Traverston, the industrial mine near Glasgow. The family fortunes seem to have been a Northamptonshire Baron Robert de Quincey, who acquired Traverston, the industrial mine near Glasgow. The family fortunes seem to have been a Northamptonshire Baron Robert de Quincey, who acquired Traverston, the industrial mine near Glasgow.

History records that he set out for the first time in 1748. According to the ballad, Seyer returns from Palestine to find that his kinsman and best friend, Sir Malcolm Carberry, of Carberry Tower, has played him false by making love to his betrothed, the Lady Elena Seton, and with the aid of evidence forced by a monk, has led her to believe in his having been killed in battle. Lady Elena, however, would not listen to the monk's tale, and she fled, but withers away and dies. Seyer de Quincey arrives some days afterwards from the Holy Land, forces his way to the wick in the little Abbey where his betrothed lies dead in her shroud, and finds his engagement ring still on her finger. Learning how Sir Malcolm had persecuted her with his attentions, he fought with him in the grounds around Carberry Tower and wounded him mortally. A monk then New Battle Abbey is sent for in hot haste to shroud the dying knight; and the priest in question happens to be the very Father Rector of the Abbey, and the document furnishing the false

Voice of the People

Communications must not contain more than 300 words. When this limit is exceeded letters will be returned. No anonymous communications will be accepted. A stamped envelope, with the writer's address, must accompany every communication.

Senator Strode on a Ninety-Day Session.
To the Editor of the Times-Dispatch:—Sir,—Opposing the constitutional amendment allowing an extension of the legislative session, you recently quoted from me the statement attributed to me opposition to this amendment.

As my contributions to the Progress are limited to one occasion, I have over my initial S. without which nothing appears from me therein, and as I have a large number of letters, I am not entitled to the credit thereof.

Experience during three sessions has convinced me that the legislative session of Virginia cannot be satisfactorily accomplished in a biennial session of sixty days. However, the Legislature thus limited cannot properly sift the many measures offered.

At every session about 1,000 bills are introduced. To winnow the good from the bad requires time. Whatever their demerits, the House and Senate were this year hard working. The session of 1909-10 found the calendars congested with more than thirty pages of the titles of bills, good, bad, indifferent, sent up by the committees, which had expended a vast amount of labor upon them.

Thus the short session is the very best ally that special interests and opponents of reform in Virginia have. It is the hasty passage of ill-digested legislation to be preferred to the false consideration and enactment of such laws only as the Legislature may have reasonable opportunity properly to consider, and shall the will of the majority, now frequently balked, continue to be the will of a few interested parties? Find their best bulwark in the short sessions? AUBREY E. STRODE. Amherst, October 14.

Make this Bank Your Bank National State and City Bank

OF RICHMOND, VA.
Capital . . \$1,000,000.00
Surplus . . \$ 600,000.00
WM. H. PALMER, President.
JOHN S. ELLETT, Vice-President.
WM. M. HILL, Vice-President.
J. W. SINTON, Vice-President.
JULIEN H. HILL, Cashier.
Three per cent. per annum interest allowed on Savings Deposits, compounded every six months.